

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
ARIZONA ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS TASK FORCE**

August 28, 2007

1:30 p.m., MST

The Arizona English Language Learners (ELL) Task Force met in Room 1 of the Arizona Senate Building, 1700 W. Washington Street, Phoenix, Arizona. Mr. Alan Maguire, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 1:39 p.m. MST.

1. Call to Order

Present:

Mr. Alan Maguire, Chairman

Mr. Jim DiCello

Ms. Margaret Garcia Dugan

Ms. Eileen Klein

Ms. Karen Merritt

Absent:

Dr. John Baracy

Dr. Eugene Garcia

Ms. Johanna Haver

Ms. Anna Rosas

A quorum was present for the purpose of conducting business.

2. Approval of April 12, 2007; April 26, 2007; May 3, 2007; May 17, 2004; May 24, 2007; and June 14, 2007 minutes of Task Force meetings

Chairman Alan Maguire held this agenda item to the next meeting when more Task Force members would be present.

3. Discussion of Structured English Immersion Models based on the June 15, 2007 draft version

Chairman Alan Maguire asked for the Task Force members to discuss issues raised by the public hearings in the previous meeting. He identified several items including how to include content in the ELD instruction; the suggestion made during the August 15, 2007 Task Force meeting by Mr. Maguire to allow second year ELL students to take fewer than four hours of ELD if they tested proficient in any of the sub-levels; how to handle schools and districts with very low ELL populations; and the development of in-course assessment.

Mr. Maguire has been working with consultants on the content issue to develop language to explain the kind of content that will be included in English Language Development classes. He stated that instructors may have thought it would be a much narrower amount of content. He said that during the next meeting he hopes to have a proposal for the appropriate amount of content in ELD.

Mr. Maguire stated that, regarding second year ELL students taking fewer than four hours of ELD based on sub-level test scores, students could opt out of sub-level classes in which they tested proficient. ADE is looking at the alignment between the test components of AZELLA and the ELD classes to determine which classes are affected.

Regarding schools with extremely low numbers of ELL students, ADE is examining options to offer these schools. These will be presented at the next meeting.

Mr. Maguire stated that in-course assessment should develop naturally from the DSI and ELL Proficiency Standards as the ELD classes are put together. The Task Force will want to observe these assessments to see if they are effective in monitoring progress.

Mr. Maguire asked the Task Force if there were any other issues that needed to be discussed. There were none.

4. Discussion of Structured English Immersion (SEI) budget request forms based on the June 15, 2007 SEI Models

Chairman Alan Maguire discussed the revised version of the budget request form (Attachment A), which had been changed based on further research and review of issues raised in the last Task Force meeting. One new section on page two calculates expenses for the transportation of staff for training purposes and includes greater delineation of training costs. Page three includes the offsets, as they were referred to in the revised statute. Research is being done regarding desegregation money and agreements and how they will figure into the completion of the SEI budget request forms. Other costs are funded by federal monies, and this issue may require more research, but the Arizona statute is very clear. Mr. Maguire stated that the Task Force may have to wrestle with this issue. He will research the interrelationship of funds.

Ms. Eileen Klein asked for someone to walk through the changes. She noted a change on #1 from an estimated salary of \$42,000 to a more general description. Mr. Maguire stated that this was changed because the figure will change each year, and rather than having to go back to the Task Force to approve the changes each year, they could allow ADE to make the calculation, by having this form refer to another form with the current year's figure. This is a good approximation of current average salary.

Ms. Klein asked what the expectation was for the blank area under "Explanation." Mr. Maguire stated that this area on the form was where schools could list unusual circumstances or requests,

such as 26% rather than 25% for incremental teacher benefits, or a different salary for teachers at schools such as charter schools. Mr. Jim DiCello commented that the budget requests would go through a review at ADE determining the reliability of the information and requests. That box will help ADE staff in this function.

Ms. Klein asked if this was all explained somewhere. Mr. Maguire stated that this document was part of a much longer document with all of the instructions. Ms. Klein asked to see the larger document. Ms. Karen Merritt agreed.

Ms. Klein asked about item ten and the training expenses. She asked if the training will be directly provided by ADE, or if it will include ADE-approved training through other sites such as the university. Mr. Maguire stated that the initial training will probably be through ADE direct instruction, but that this method may change later. Ms. Margaret Garcia Dugan commented that later on, they may use IDEAL, a web-based training as well as face-to-face training. Ms. Klein stated that she didn't want anything on the form that would impede schools' abilities to comply. She suggested letting other innovators develop training that the ADE could approve.

In addition, Ms. Klein commented that the legal disclosure statement she had brought attention to during the last meeting was still on the form. She asked if this was the appropriate place for it. Mr. Maguire stated that the statute's language is inconsistent with the judge's order concerning the content of the budget form, and since this judgment is pending appeal, the content of the budget form may change. Mr. Maguire stated that by mentioning the dispute, if the Judge's order is upheld, no harm has been done since the possibility has already been recognized. It provides the most flexibility, having the content mandated by statute but also calling attention to the legal issue which might change the content. The content most affected would be the offsets.

Ms. Merritt asked for clarification on teacher salaries, asking whether a school that needs to hire additional teachers with high experience at a pay exceeding the average would be funded the average salary or the actual salary. She also asked if funding was based on the prior year's rates, so if a raise went into effect, would funding still reflect the prior year. Mr. Maguire stated that all funding is based on figures from the prior year. Ms. Merritt asked if there could be an amendment based on real cost. Mr. Maguire stated that there could be, but they need to keep the regular budget process consistent. There would have to be a way to review and verify all information on the forms.

Ms. Merritt stated she would comment more on the budget form once she had reviewed it more carefully, but her immediate concern was that there was nothing to reflect hidden costs. The precise placement via the AZELLA test is very labor intensive. She asked who, a teacher or other staff, would administer the AZELLA, particularly the oral portion. The assessments are sent to Harcourt for scoring, received back, and then adjustments are made to the preliminary placement of students based on the test scores. Additionally, all paperwork must be checked. Costs are associated with the process. Ms. Merritt asked if the Title and desegregation funds would have to be first funneled into the models, and if so, what would be left for the

administrative purposes. She added that there should be funding for things such as software for curriculum use in ELD classes.

Ms. Garcia Dugan stated that computers and software could come out of Title III funds. She stated that the budget form does not stipulate that Title monies must be used for the models, but only that they can be used toward that purpose. Schools and districts may continue to use Title and desegregation funding for normal usage. Title III money could be used for testing personnel. Mr. Jim DiCello stated that there is funding for the AZELLA today, and that this would not change with the adoption of the models. Schools do not have to use Title I to reduce the Arizona budgeted funding.

Mr. DiCello commented that incremental costs of moving experienced teachers into teaching ELD would really only involve the hiring of new teachers to replace them in the old classrooms.

Mr. Maguire stated he would get someone to clarify the use of federal funding.

5. Discussion of implementation and training schedule of Structured English Immersion Models based on the June 15, 2007 draft version

Mr. John Stollar spoke on behalf of Arizona Department of Education. He reviewed the training schedule, stating that ADE has scheduled five full days of training with Mr. Kevin Clark which will be completed by September 12. The complete OELAS staff will receive training on the research models, the legal aspects, the alignment between the assessment and standards, the particulars of implementation strategies and the DSI. ADE has planned ten regional one-day workshops available to everybody, including ELL coordinators, principals, and teachers. The schedule on this is nearly ready. Mr. Stollar stated that by September 12, ADE will be able to assist any district that has questions. The regional workshops should handle many of the questions that districts have.

Ms. Karen Merritt asked if Mr. Clark is writing the curriculum. Mr. Stollar replied that he is. Ms. Merritt asked if there will be a review of this curriculum by Arizona educators. Mr. Stollar replied that the Task Force has given direction to the overall process. ADE will develop and deliver the training. ADE will then get feedback from the field that they can deliver back to the Task Force and use to refine the training and the DSI.

Ms. Eileen Klein asked if all training will take place at the same time. The models mention three sets of training including the models overview, the DSI, and teaching methods. Mr. Stollar stated that they would be presented in a series of rounds of training, and that they are connected, not discrete. The one day training will be followed by a three day training session on the content of the ELD classes. Then ADE will give people time to implement the training. Round Three will be offering on-demand training for interested parties. Round Four will be listening to feedback from teachers on what is successful and not successful and combine that with new

content. Round Five will be an end-of-implementation-year review to determine best practices and needed modifications.

Ms. Klein clarified that the regional workshops are open to both districts and charter schools. Mr. Stollar stated that both would be included. Ms. Klein asked approximately how many will be trained per district and what a timeline would look like. Mr. Alan Maguire stated that the plan is to have five teams of two people teaching the three-day sessions. Mr. Stollar replied that ideally classes will have 60 educators or fewer to allow interaction. He said that, looking at the logistics, he believed they could meet the demand for training throughout the state. They would first fill the slots in the regional training, and then ADE staff members could travel to districts having special requests. He commented that some districts might send one person or all of their team; this would be left up to the school or district.

Ms. Klein asked if within a year if schools and districts will have the tools to be in compliance with the models and the law. Mr. Stollar said they were making their best effort toward this. ADE is also considering offering a summer institute for schools that may not be able to send their teachers for training during the school year. The summer institute would be a five day program. Ms. Klein asked if all schools will have had the opportunity for training within a year so that they can be in compliance. Mr. Stollar said yes, and that, in addition, training will be ongoing, providing new insights and methods each year.

Ms. Margaret Garcia Dugan commented that she believed it would not be a huge change in the minds of ELL teachers, because they are probably already doing 70% of what they need to be doing. She added that this is more of a refinement, a honing of skills, and focusing more on what is already out in the ELL Proficiency standards. The models will let teachers know what to teach when.

Ms. Karen Merritt asked Mr. Stollar to calculate the number of hours of training. Mr. Stollar said that including all five rounds about eight days of training could be taken by educators. Ms. Merritt asked if ADE was looking at a train-the-trainer approach, where teachers could train more of their staff. She also asked about the reimbursement for substitutes needed so that teachers would be able to attend training. She made a suggestion of offering Saturday day training. Mr. Stollar said that ADE would be willing to consider these options.

Ms. Merritt asked if #11 on the budget request form needs to be reworded for training options, including a paid or unpaid summer training session. Mr. Stollar said this would be a local decision by districts. Ms. Garcia Dugan commented that these hours could go toward the 180 hours of professional development required. A district can't pay for the time as well as give credit; it is either one or the other. Mr. DiCello stated that #10 on the budget form could refer to workshop reimbursement as well as travel expenses, not #11, since that covers substitute teachers.

Mr. Maguire commented, for the record, that the expectation of district compliance, the schedule of the law, and the department's role in this is reasonable given the structure and organization of

schools, how schools operate the budget, how the districts hire teachers and schedule classes, and given the number of teachers and classrooms for which the draft models calls. He stated that only in the year following the adoption, approval, and implementation of the models should schools and districts be held accountable. Given the current schedule of tasks, this would be the 2008-2009 school year. He stated that this does not in any way obviate the law, which set the impossible task of adopting models before the law ever went into effect, but gives a clear sequence of events that must take place regardless of timeline. Mr. Maguire stated that he has stated his position on this to the educational community as well as in his guidance to ADE.

6. Discussion of process for submission and approval of proposed programs from school districts or charter schools

Chairman Alan Maguire stated that there seemed to be three essential ingredients of an alternative model that would meet the standards of the Task Force for approval. First, there will need to be a detailed description similar in format to the Task Force's draft models. Second, the model will need to be in compliance with statute. Third, the model will need to be research-based and cost effective.

During the next meeting, Mr. Maguire stated that the Task Force would try to develop a method for schools and districts to submit an alternative model and the steps necessary for the Task Force to review and come to a decision on it. There would be a submittal, a review, time to discuss the model, any possible modifications, and either an approval or denial of the proposed model.

Mr. Jim DiCello suggested that schools first submit the proposed model to ADE, who could conduct a summary review to present to the Task Force and a recommendation. Ms. Karen Merritt suggested a template application for ease of review. If all the elements of the model were found in the same sequence, it would be simpler to conduct a review. Ms. Margaret Garcia Dugan stated that all models considered would have to include the principles from the statute that English would be taught by an English fluent teacher using materials in English. She said she wasn't sure if this was inherent or needed to be stated.

7. Presentation and discussion of upcoming Task Force activities

Mr. Alan Maguire stated that the Task Force's tasks will follow the order of the agenda items above, three through six. That is, the draft models will need to go through final edits and be approved by the Task Force, the budget request form will need to go through final edits and be approved, and the implementation and training schedule will need to be finalized. The next Task Force meeting will be on September 13. Mr. Maguire will send out language clarifications, the next budget request form draft, a draft training schedule, and the first draft of a submittal and review process for alternate models. Work on the DSI is progressing, and is going through an

independent review process to ensure that the DSI is consistent with the Arizona K-12 ELL Proficiency Standards.

8. Call to the Public

A call to the public was made at 2:45 p.m. No speakers were present.

9. Discussion of future meetings

The next ELL Task Force meeting will take place on September 13, at 1:30 p.m.

10. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:46 p.m. The motion was made by Ms. Margaret Garcia Dugan and seconded by Mr. Jim DiCello.

Arizona ELL Task Force

Alan Maguire, Chairman